



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,571	12/07/2000	Barbara Huff	2585-006	2427

7590 06/07/2004  
Roberts Abokhair & Mardula, LLC  
Suite 1000  
11800 Sunrise Drive  
Reston, VA 20191-5302

EXAMINER

TRAN, ELLEN C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SL

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/731,571

Applicant(s)

HUFF ET AL.

Examiner

Ellen C Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**NORMAN M. WRIGHT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communication: original application filed 7 December 2000.
2. Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, and 23 are independent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language

4. **Claims 1-7, 9, 16-18, 20, 23, and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Xu et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,738,362 (hereinafter '362).

**As to independent claim 1, "A method for dial roaming for users having a home non-LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) region to allow access comprising: dialing into a local dial access provider; creating an access request; forwarding the dial access request" is taught in '362 col. 4, lines 14-25;**

**"to a corporate remote authentication dial-in user service (RADIUS) server; proxying the request to a regional RADIUS server associated with the user's home region; accessing the regional user database to determine if the user is present in the regional database; authenticating the user; and providing configuration information to the user to allow access to the network" is shown in '362 col. 4, line 55 through col. 5 line 25.**

Art Unit: 2134

As to dependent claim 2, “wherein the access request is forwarded to an access provider via a network access server (NAS)” is disclosed in ‘362 col. 3, lines 41-48.

As to dependent claim 3, “wherein the NAS functions as a client of the corporate RADIUS server” is taught in ‘362 col. 7, lines 39-45.

As to dependent claim 4, “further comprising: the corporate RADIUS server determining if the user is a member of an LDAP or non-LDAP region” is shown in ‘362 col. 7, lines 54-57.

As to dependent claim 5, “wherein the determining if the user is a member of an LDAP or non-LDAP region is accomplished by reviewing a configuration file stored in the corporate RADIUS server” is disclosed in ‘362 col. 7, lines 59-67.

As to dependent claim 6, “further comprising forwarding the access request to a regional LDAP database if the home region is LDAP enabled” is taught in ‘362 col. 8, lines 9-24.

As to dependent claim 7, “further comprising the regional LDAP database authenticating the user” is shown in ‘362 col. 7, lines 59-67.

As to dependent claim 9, “wherein the access request comprises a user name and password” is taught in ‘362 col. 2, lines 21-24.

As to independent claim 16, this claim is directed to the system of the method of claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 18, “wherein the non-LDAP regional server further comprises a user database and access instructions for authenticating the user access request in the non-LDAP server database” is shown in ‘362 col. 4, lines 45-49.

As to dependent claims 17 and 20, these claims contain text that is substantially similar to claims 4 and 9, therefore they are rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 23, “A system for authenticating users using a standard RADIUS protocol against a non-standard subscriber management system and database comprising: a RADIUS server, having a RADIUS authentication protocol, connected to a first network for receiving an access request from a user; a subscriber management server, connected to a second network, comprising a user database for authenticating the user access request over the second network; and a database view created in memory on the subscriber management server for providing user access information in the correct format for the RADIUS authentication protocol” is taught in ‘362 col. 4, line 55 through col. 5 line 25.

As to dependent claim 24 this claim contains text that is substantially similar to claim 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 8, 10-12, 14, 19, 22, and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘362 as applied to claims 1, 16, and 23 in further view of Liu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,898,780 (hereinafter ‘780).

Art Unit: 2134

**As to dependent claim 10, the following is not taught in '362 "wherein the user name comprises a regional naming convention for identifying the home region of the user"** however '780 teaches "the user logs on to the local network of the foreign internet service provider using an identifier that includes the user's identification term, an identification term for the server of the home ISP" in col. 1, lines 25-27 "".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a mobile Internet Protocol service provider taught in '362 to include a means to recognize the home service provider. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to increase the ability to provide wireless Internet coverage see '780 (col. 1, lines 9 et seq.) "The apparatus of the present invention comprises a server or servers that can recognize the domain name of the home ISP".

**As to dependent claim 8, "further comprising the regional LDAP database sending an "accept" message if the user is in the regional LDAP database and a "deny" message if the user is not in the regional LDAP database"** is disclosed in '780 col. 4, lines 50-65 "transmits a message to the server 132 either stating that the user 144 should be granted or denied internet access".

**As to dependent claim 11, "wherein the user name comprises an email address of the user"** is shown in '780 col. 1, lines 31-33 "For example, the user might log o to the local network of the local ISP by using a standard e-mail address such as jdoe@aimnet.com. Followed by the user's secret password".

**As to dependent claim 12, "further comprising comparing the user password to the password stored in the non-LDAP database"** is disclosed in '780 col. 4, lines 50-61 "Block

Art Unit: 2134

162 indicates that the server 136 includes software attempts to match the “roaming” login information in an entry in a log table in the server 136”.

**As to dependent claim 14, “wherein the database of the non-LDAP regions is an subscriber management system (SMS) database.”** is taught in ‘780 col. 4, lines 50-51 “Block 162 indicates that the server 136 includes software that attempts to match the “roaming” login information with an entry in a log table in the server 136”.

**As to dependent claims 19, 22, and 25** these claims contain text that is substantially similar to claims 14, 8, and 11 respectively therefore they are rejected along the same rationale.

7. **Claims 13, 15, 21, 26, and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘362 as applied to claims 1, 16, and 23 in further view of ‘780 and in further view of Xu et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,151,628 (hereinafter ‘628).

**As to dependent claim 13, the following is not taught in ‘362 “wherein the password from the database is CHAP hashed, and wherein the password delivered to the database is CHAP hashed, and wherein the password comparison comprises comparing; the CHAP hashed password delivered to the database. with the CHAP hashed password extracted from the database.”** however ‘628 teaches “In a preferred network access embodiment of the invention, a second phase authentication routine is employed to verify that the remote user is authorized to access the designated network. This is accomplished by conducting a password authentication procedure such PAP or CHAP routine both of which are known in the art” in col. 9, lines 48-57.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a mobile Internet Protocol service provider with ability to recognize ISP provider

Art Unit: 2134

taught in the combination of '362 and '780 to include a means provide additional security. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to increase the ability of Internet service providers to serve many users see '628 (col. 2, lines 1 et seq.) "The present invention also provides for network access methods by which a network access server, in combination with one or more authentication servers, can provide Internet and corporate network authentication and access".

**As to dependent claim 15, "wherein the password is hashed to maintain security"** is taught in '628 col. 4, lines 45-54 "With this architecture, it is possible to divorce the location of the initial dial-up server (communications chassis 20) from the location at with the intermediate network ... to gain secure access to their corporate or private network".

**As to dependent claim 21,** this claim contains text that is substantially similar to claim 15 and is rejected along the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 26,** this claim contains text that is substantially similar to claim 13 and is rejected along the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 27,** this claim contains text that is substantially similar to claim 8 and is rejected along the same rationale.




Art Unit: 2134

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen C Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8917. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

  
NORMAN M. WRIGHT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Ellen Tran,  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2134  
20 May 2004